



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/559,551	04/27/2006	Edward Fey	50047/015002	5268
21559	7590	03/17/2008		
CLARK & ELBING LLP	EXAMINER			
101 FEDERAL STREET	CLARK, AMY LYNN			
BOSTON, MA 02110	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
	1655			
		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		03/17/2008	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentadministrator@clarkelbing.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/559,551	FEY ET AL.
	Examiner Amy L. Clark	Art Unit 1655

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 December 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) 1-56 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claims 1-27, drawn to a joint enhancing composition adapted for oral administration, wherein said composition increases the endogenous expression of lubricin by at least 10% relative to an untreated control.

Group II, claims 28-33, drawn to a method of lubricating a joint in a mammal by administering to said mammal a therapeutically effective amount of a joint enhancing composition adapted for oral administration, wherein said composition increases the endogenous expression of lubricin by at least 10% relative to an untreated control.

Group III, claims 34-56, drawn to a method of treating, reducing or preventing a degenerative joint disorder by administering to said mammal a therapeutically effective amount of a joint enhancing composition adapted for oral administration, wherein said composition increases the endogenous expression of lubricin by at least 10% relative to an untreated control.

The inventions listed as Groups I-III do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

Claim 1, at least, is anticipated by or obvious over Yerxa (A, US PreGrant Publication Number: 2003/0069272 A1). Yerxa teaches a composition for altering the amount of synovial fluids, such as lubricin, wherein the composition enhances joint lubrication and stimulation of secretion of lubricin and wherein the composition comprises nicotinic acetylcholine receptor agonist and a carrier. Yerxa further teaches that the composition may be administered orally. Consequently, the special technical feature which links the claims does not provide a contribution over the prior art, so unity of the invention is lacking.

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

Group I:

Please note that Applicant is required to elect one specific combination.

Applicant is first required to elect one combination of ingredients from claims 2-10 or from claims 11-17 or from claims 18-27.

-If Applicant elects from claims 2-10, then Applicant is required to elect at least 15 substances from claim 2.

-If Applicant elects the combination of ingredients from claims 18-27, Applicant is required to elect one therapeutic agent from claim 19 or claim 27, either one corticosteroid from claim 21 or one anti-inflammatory drug from claim 22 or one antibiotic from claim 23 or one anti-fungal agent from claim 24, or one anti-viral agent from claim 26.

Please note that when making the election required by the Examiner, please make sure that the specific composition and corresponding specific disease state that were elected has sufficient support in the specification. An election of all ingredients from all claims that are subject to the requirement would not be appropriate unless a preferred embodiment of the invention specifically contains all ingredients from all claims to be elected from above.

Group II:

i.) please elect articular joint from a knee, hip, ankle, shoulder or elbow from claim 30.

ii.) please elect either human, dog or horse from claim 31.

Group III:

i.) please elect one disorder from claim 35.

ii.) please elect one therapeutic agent from claim 39 or 47.

-if an anti-inflammatory is elected from claim 39, further elect either non steroidial anti-inflammatory drug or corticosteroid from claim 40,

-if a corticosteroid is elected, further elect one corticosteroid from claim 41.

-if an anti-inflammatory is elected, further elect one anti-inflammatory from claim 42.

-if an antibiotic is elected, further elect one antibiotic from claim 43.

-if an anti-fungal agent is elected, further elect one anti-fungal agent from claim 44.

-if an analgesic agent is elected, further elect one analgesic agent from claim 46.

iii.) please elect either human from claim 52, dog from claim 53 or horse from claim 55.

-if dog is elected, further elect one disorder from claim 54.

-if horse is elected, further elect one disorder from claim 56.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner:

The following claims are generic: claims 1-9, 11, 12, 18-20, 28, 29, 32, 34-36, 38-40, 49, 50, 53 and 55.

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

The species do not share a common core structure.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does

not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the

above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amy L. Clark whose telephone number is (571)272-1310. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday between 8:30am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terry McKelvey can be reached on (571) 272-0775. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Amy L. Clark
AU 1655

Amy L. Clark
March 4, 2008

/Michele Flood/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1655